



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Anthropologist

NEW SERIES

VOL. 22

JANUARY-MARCH, 1920

No. 1

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COÖRDINATION IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH¹

By CLARK WISSLER

THE creation of a joint Division of the National Research Council to represent anthropology and psychology brings us together here in order that we may consider how and to what degree the aims of both may be coördinated. I have been asked to outline some of the problems that invite such coöordination, but before entering upon the specific discussion of opportunities for coöordination and coöperation, some general orientation seems necessary. In the first place, we are dealing with two distinct sciences, each of which grew up in its own way and each of which shows every indication of being able to stand upon its own feet. These two sciences differ not only in their points of view, but also in their major contents. About the only ground they seem to have in common is that they both study men. It is true that psychology gives a large place to the study of animal intelligence, but on the other hand, anthropology also concerns itself with morphological problems among the higher mammals and even dips into the pairing and other social habits of the anthropoids. There is, however, a difference in that anthropology is at present largely concerned with the morphology of the case, while psychology puts its emphasis upon what it chooses to recognize as intelligence. Yet this distinction should not obscure the other relations and attitudes of the two sciences. Thus, psychology gives a great deal of attention to the ways of doing things, learning, habit, etc.; and again, anthro-

¹ Address before the joint session of the American Psychological Association and the American Anthropological Association, at Harvard University, December 30, 1919.

pology is interested in similar problems, for it is taking infinite pains to trace out human tool concepts and other fundamental processes from the beginning of palaeolithic time. It has gathered from the remote corners of the earth data on the concepts and habits that underlie these processes. In fact, the anthropologists are gradually putting together the facts that are to constitute the history of human psychical functions from the beginning to the present. I predict that when that story begins to be rounded out psychologists will find it one of the most fascinating chapters in science. Anyway they, and they alone, will be able to interpret it in terms of functioning individual intelligence. Thus it is apparent, that the common tendency of the two sciences to study men and their performances, does bring them into direct contact at many points where a full interpretation of the results obtained in the pursuit of one science depends upon the insight obtained in the other.

But notwithstanding these obvious overlappings there is one difference in which lies the clearest and most tangible distinction between the two sciences. Psychology takes as its unit phenomenon the mind of man, whatever that may mean. If I were speaking anywhere except among the greatest psychologists of the world, I should know exactly what was meant by the mind of man and should expect no challenge, but here it is well to be cautious. Yet, one thing we can be sure of and that is, that psychology is concerned with a group of functions that center in a man. His individual performances are always the point of departure.

Anthropology, on the other hand, takes the group as its unit and point of departure. It is not greatly concerned with the function of the individual in the group. In fact, if the anthropologist did center his interest on the individual in the group he would soon be indistinguishable from a psychologist. The anthropologist is not interested in the problem as to how the individual fits himself into the group, how he learns the tasks required of him by his group, or even with his inherent specific reactions to the life of the group. He is, however, vitally interested in what the group requires of the individual and by what steps the group came to exact these requirements. Thus the psychologist may be interested in the successive

functional processes by which a child eventually acquires the art of writing a letter; the anthropologist, on the other hand, cares nothing about that, but seeks to know what brought the group to the formalization and exaction of such a requirement, to which end he compares groups both as to their performances and as to their organic constituents. In more general terms the psychologist deals with what goes on within the individual when confronted by the group and the environment, while the anthropologist gives his attention to what goes on in the group when confronted by other groups and environments. These distinctions would be absolutely clear cut, if individuals did not constitute the group and so prevent one fixing his attention upon the group exclusively. Without the anthropological eye it is often difficult to see the group instead of the individuals composing it.

The anthropologist is put to great trouble to classify his groups, or units. So far, this has occupied a large part of his time; but in the study of the group he is for the most part seeking its origin and so puts more emphasis upon the genetic history of the group than does the psychologist upon the genesis of the individual. Again the anthropologist has a two-sided problem in the group, he seeks to comprehend it zoologically on the one hand, while on the other, he deals with the psychic functional history of the group. He recognizes in the latter what he calls the *culture* of the group. By that term he means all social activities in the broadest sense, such as language, marriage, property system, etiquette, industries, art, etc.

It is a curious fact that the men who are most deeply engaged in a science are the very ones who are least able to give a clear-cut statement of its limits. This lack of precision may be the result of contentions among ourselves as to the precise limits of our definitions. But we should not permit our internal clashes of opinion to obscure and distort the fundamental pervading distinction between the objectives of the two sciences. The anthropologists are not unaware of the conflicts in the psychological camp, the noise of the battle has at times been audible from afar. Some of us have seen the old and time honored human soul forcibly

ejected from the psychological domain; later we heard that psychology had lost consciousness; and now the report is that it is losing its mind. Nor have we escaped hearing about the wavering fortunes of the behaviorists, etc.

On the other hand, the psychologists cannot be entirely ignorant of the lack of harmony in the anthropological camp. They have doubtless heard the battle cry of those who believe the cephalic index to be the type of a universal index by which even differences in human performances may be explained. Again, they may have heard of the unrelenting fight between the evolutionists and the supporters of the historical method. Also the somewhat acrimonious contention over the functional potential equality of racial groups, there being those who believe that the observed differences are due to convention and fortuitous events. Finally, the psychologists may have taken some casual interest in the heralding of a new onslaught against scientific tradition under a banner labeled the superorganic. Perhaps when we get a clear view of this new anthropological doctrine and tear away the camouflage, we shall find under it the poor old discarded soul of the psychologists.

It is to be hoped that the members of our division will have just enough of the sense of humor to get the true perspective of these necessary and healthy struggles, so that they may keep their eyes fixed upon the fundamental objectives of the two sciences, which in the terms of everyday speech are *mind* and *race*, respectively. At any rate, if we now keep this main distinction in mind, we can see the full justification for a joint division comprising psychology and anthropology. We have at least one common objective, *viz.*, racial characters. These characters may be anatomical, mental, and cultural. Thus it is that the results of psychological tests upon the racial elements in the army are of the utmost importance to anthropology. On the other hand, the parts these new-found degrees of capacity may play as factors in the culture complex of the group is the problem of anthropology and the final results of this investigation should also be of great import to psychology. The situation can, then, be stated as follows: it must be the policy of the Division to support jointly the development of each science

independently, but in addition, the Division as a whole must make it its special business to throw its united strength upon the study of racial and social groups.

Since I have been asked to speak of possible ways of coöperation and coördination in the work of the Division, I need not discuss the special problems of psychology on the one hand, nor those of anthropology on the other. It seems unnecessary to say that when we speak of coöperating, we do not mean that anthropologists shall do the work of psychologists, and *vice versa*—nothing of the kind. It should be obvious that there are many important problems in anthropology that make no appeal to psychologists. For example, it would be too much to expect psychologists to care about the excavation of a shell-heap in Patagonia, or to show enthusiasm for a study of the relationship systems for Melanesia. Yet the pursuit of these problems may mean a great deal for the future of anthropology. Likewise there are numerous psychological problems of great import to psychology, for which no anthropologist will show much in the way of appreciation—for example the behavior of a white rat in a maze. There is no reason, however, why each half of our division cannot give sympathetic support to what the other considers of vital import to the development of its science. Hence, we have now to consider only such problems as fall within the domain of the common objective. As we have just seen, this common objective is the study of human groups—racial, cultural, and mental.

However, at this point it may be profitable to turn back and again contrast anthropology and psychology from quite a different angle. Instead of considering the main objectives of the two sciences, let us look into their histories and accomplishments. The "new psychology" of twenty-five years ago, now the psychology you profess, has been from the start a practical science, potentially so, if not actually. No doubt many of you will resent this statement, but the facts in your history cannot be denied. Those of you who were in educational work thirty or more years ago know how the whole teaching profession of the country took to psychology as an applied science. It is not strange then to find it one of the

leading subjects in normal schools, training colleges, and schools of education. The old and long established psychology of the university could do no other than yield to this great external pressure for applied psychology. The history of the case need not be recited to you, it is obvious that the prestige now held by psychology is due to its achievements as an applied science. "Mental engineering" is now a favorite slogan, and everyone knows that the term engineering implies applied science. I do not wish to be understood as denying that psychology has not maintained its position as a pure science, I desire only that all of us take account of the strong development of applied psychology and the consequent richness in the psychological personnel and resources.

Anthropology, on the other hand, has so far stood as a pure science. It has not been the source to which the teaching profession or any other profession looked for guidance. Even today the number of our universities and colleges maintaining strong departments can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Research in anthropology has been supported almost exclusively through museums. That anthropology has been essentially a museum growth is clear when we note that even in the few large universities with departments, these departments were the outgrowths of university museums. It is not far wrong to say, then, that most anthropologists of the immediate past made their living as museum housekeepers and gave what spare time they could to the development of anthropology as a pure science. The result of this is a limited personnel and material resources. Had there been a vast professional host knocking at the doors of our museums and demanding practical guidance in their everyday work, there would have been a different story to recite here. Further, if I mistake not the signs of the hour, those who stand here ten years hence will have a far different story to tell.

But, it may be asked, what have these museum men been doing behind their closed doors? This is easily answered; they have been face to face with problems of race. They have developed techniques for dealing with the zoölogy of man and also with his culture. Yet the subjects of their investigations have been the

lowly and backward peoples of the earth. On this account, anthropologists have been frequently denounced. Not so very long ago I heard a distinguished scientist say something like this, "The trouble with these anthropologists is that they while away their time studying Indians, Negroes, Bushmen, and other savages, when they should study Europeans: Europeans are the only people that count."

Now there are several reasons why the anthropologists have studied these "lowly peoples." For one thing, nobody objected. There were beneficent gentlemen willing to pay for this sort of thing, but who would not stand for having their families or friends investigated. Cities would support museums of anthropology so long as that subject was not in any way connected with the lives of their citizens. So the anthropologist bided his time. If any of you doubt his industry begin to round up the literature of the subject and to study a large museum. You will find that practically no savage group has escaped him.

Also, the anthropologist wished to be humane; his position was not unlike that of the much abused "animal experimenter" who first "tries it out on the dog." Well, he now has a profound knowledge of "the under dog"; he has confidence in the technique he has developed and his hands have long been itching for a chance to lay hold of Europeans and their cultures; in short, the anthropologist has arrived at the table of the National Research Council, dropped thereon his instrument case and announced that he is ready for the patient. Just how the psychologists will receive the newcomer remains to be seen; they have been at the bedside already, taken the first steps in diagnosis, and show some tendency to regard the case as their own. In proof of this, I may be permitted to quote a few words from the Proceedings of the Psychological Association at Baltimore, just one year ago:

The course of events has put America under bonds to find and develop the social and mental factors that make for a stable social equilibrium. This is peculiarly the job of American psychology.

Another speaker forcibly defended the thesis that, "The future of the world depends upon the American psychologists."

My citation of these words from these very eminent psychologists is not to scoff. On behalf of the anthropologists, I take this opportunity to congratulate the psychologists upon their glorious achievements in the war and to express our joy in the confidence with which they now turn to the gigantic problems of peace.

But what are these great problems the psychologists are to attack? They seem to be the problems that arise in such phenomena as "social unrest," "profit-sharing," "shop-management," immigration, vocational training, Americanization, international relations, etc. Certain it is that if psychology is to save the world, here is where she must work.

The psychologists seem to assume that the road to the solution of these world problems leads out directly from their own beaten track. Perhaps they feel confident that they can meet the situation by controlling the reactions of the individual. They may be right; but as an anthropologist, I sound a warning. The phenomena we have cited are to a large degree racial, they are moreover phenomena of culture. In short, the psychologist is about to attack a problem in culture and there are but two roads to success in this undertaking: one is for him to call upon the anthropologist for help, the other is for the psychologist to turn anthropologist. To take up one of these intricate problems in our culture without resort to the technique developed by the anthropologist, would be just as absurd as to proceed with a psychological problem, with only the technique of anthropology. The social body to which we belong may be sick, in fact I think it is, but it needs something more than psychological treatment.

We seem to be entering upon a new phase of the world's history. Some centuries ago the English people became conscious of the fact that they had a society, that society could be improved or rationally manipulated by the use of scientific knowledge. This was a great achievement and is regarded as the foundation of modern life. Now we are about to make another advance; the English-speaking people are about to become conscious of having a culture, conscious of the fact that each racial, or biological group has its culture. Then will come the realization that problems in culture

can be met by the application of the appropriate scientific technique.

I repeat then, that the anthropologists are ready. Unlike the psychologists they have not had their chance; the hope is that it will come through this new organization. We look to the psychologists with their long experience in human engineering and their large and varied personnel to lead out. Of specific problems there is no end.

For example, many years ago an anthropologist discovered some curious retarding influences when he compared the statures of children in a charitable institution with those living at home.¹ His suggestion was that some forces might operate in institutional life to retard development. The problem, then, is do children in even the best of charitable institutions grow as we think they should? Let us as psychologists and anthropologists attack this question to find out what zoölogical and psychological factors are involved here. Suppose, in short, that we investigate the whole case of institutional life to see what is happening to these children. This would present a fine opportunity for the psychologists and anthropologists to work side by side, but above all, to render a great public service.

Again, we hear a great deal about Americanization and Americanization programs. The idea in this is to make one people of all who reside among us, but few will go so far as to say that this implies amalgamation. What is really meant is complete culture uniformity. Hence the problem in Americanization is to bring about the complete adoption of our culture on the part of immigrants of different cultures.

It is common knowledge that immigrants from cultures obviously different from our own settle in colonies where they maintain their native languages and customs. Some necessary adjustments seem to be made to the political and economic complexes of our culture, but otherwise the group exists as an area of foreign culture. This is recognized in popular speech when we speak of "Japanese colonies," "Italian colonies," "Armenian colonies," "Finnish colonies," etc. In such colonies we recognize a menace to our own

¹ A. Hrdlička, *Investigations on One Thousand White and Colored Children*. New York, 1904.

culture and national existence and Americanization is the general term for all efforts looking toward the substitution of our own culture for that of the "foreign colony."

The initial difficulty in all programs of Americanization comes from our lack of specific knowledge as to what goes on under the surface in these groups. No anthropologist has investigated these "colony cultures," yet there are fifty or more Indian colonies in the United States and Canada for anyone of which you can obtain a publication in which there will be found an exposition of its culture based upon investigations by anthropologists. Thousands upon thousands of dollars have been contributed by wealthy men to this end, not to mention large sums spent by the U. S. Government through its scientific bureaus. I need not mention that for the native tribes of South America, Africa, Australia, etc., we have similar studies. It seems high time, therefore, that we formulate some knowledge of the "foreign culture" colonies in our midst, before we set out gaily upon a great program of Americanization. Anthropology is ready to make the necessary investigations, if the opportunity is created.

However, the problem is not merely one of culture, for the zoölogical factor is evident in the "race question." The leveling down of differences in culture means increased contact and eventually amalgamation. It is highly important, therefore, that we study the inherent factors in the population of these colonies. We must also take up the problem of race-mixing; someone must be able to tell us what kind of men are being produced by this inevitable crossing of racial elements. Here are great groups of problems:

1. The identification of racial characters.
2. The inheritance of morphological and mental characters.
3. The effects of external conditions upon individual development.
4. The psychological factors involved in culture change.

These problems appear in another question of large proportions, *viz.*, the Negro question, or rather the mulatto problem. The psychologists have made a good beginning with their tests upon

soldiers and great things are to be expected from them in the future. What we need now is a start on the anthropological phase of the problem.

Again, applied psychology has come to hold a definite place in industrial management. Large technical schools now feel called upon to apologize if that subject does not appear in their catalogues. But when these schools send their students out to fill factory positions, they will find the racial and cultural factors ever to the fore. Of these psychological engineers we have often heard, but the anthropological engineer is also a reality; a cotton-producing corporation using native labor in several countries employs an anthropologist to show how to handle these different culture and racial groups; another anthropologist is employed by an immigration commission; etc. The textile and clothing industries are beginning to employ anthropologists to assist in training their workers and also to develop certain aspects of the industry. Since the psychologists are well advanced in the development of industrial service, it would seem advisable that our division support a committee to develop anthropological service to industry.

I think enough has been said to show in what direction our joint opportunities lie. If one of the aims of the National Research Council is to make science an effective leader in the problems of peace, then someone must take up the problems we have outlined. The opportunity seems at hand for investigations upon a much higher plane than in the past and if we accomplish nothing, we have only ourselves to blame. I know there are anthropologists who look with disfavor upon the present form of our division. They are opposed to any and all efforts looking toward coöperation and coördination. Their idea is that we should have two separate sections; in other words that we should turn our backs upon each other and set out alone. I infer that there are psychologists taking similar views. These opponents of the present policy of the division believe that the objectives and points of view of anthropology and psychology are incompatible; that there may be common ground between them, but that coöperation even here is impossible. The course of events may prove this to be correct; but

if so, the important problems we have cited will fall to no one; anthropology will become even more than before merely the detached study of the lowly and obscure peoples of the earth, her energy dissipated by internal quarrels as to the relative values of the zoölogical and cultural methods. She will lose the stimulating contacts with the large and diversified personnel of psychology and so suffer more and more the evils of isolation. On the other hand, I believe that psychology will also be the loser. She will for one thing ignore the experience and technique pertaining to a phenomenon, some aspects of which can with difficulty be distinguished from what she regards as her own. Further, she will ultimately find herself forced by public demand to take up problems of race and culture and thus to duplication of effort. As I see it the two sciences have nothing to lose and much to gain in a united effort. But far above our narrow personal interests are the needs of the nation. The hope of mankind is that science will point the way to correct procedure even in matters of education and social adjustment. The power of science, when its efforts are coördinated, was clearly demonstrated during the war. It needs no defense now. It is for psychology and anthropology to live up to the reputation of science as a whole.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY,
NEW YORK CITY.